



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/695,695

10/29/2003

Andrew C. Kesling

815-1057.C

5076

7590
LLOYD L. ZICKERT
79 West Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60603

07/29/2008

EXAMINER

LEWIS, RALPH A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3732

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Rejections Based on Prior Art

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller (3,345,745) in view of Lemchen (5,890,892).

Muller discloses an orthodontic appliance including a metal appliance body 7 (column 6 line 4) having a buccal-labial archwire receiving side and a lingual side, and a light-permeable polymer resin bonding base 16 (column 2 line 55) molded onto the lingual side of the body such that at least a part of the body is embedded in the base (column 2 line 14) and includes an integral peripheral lip overlapping part of the body. It is known to one of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosed resinous polymers are light-permeable. Lemchen teaches orthodontic polymer resin (column 4 lines 12, 16) the same as disclosed by Muller that is light, heat or chemically cured as known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the curing polymer resin to be heat or light-curing polymer resin. The appliance is capable of shipment to a user. Muller shows resin of acrylic or epoxy and the appliance is a bracket. Muller discloses a method of making the orthodontic appliance comprising making the

appliance body and molding the polymer resin to the lingual side of the body, the appliance having the features of above.

In response to the present rejection applicant argues that Muller teaches the forming of the appliance with resinous base in the orthodontist's office rather than "at the factory for shipment to a user." It is unclear to this examiner why the orthodontist's office can't be considered a "factory" and why the movement of the constructed bracket to the patient does not meet the "shipment" limitation. Alternatively, it would seem obvious on its face for a lower paid technician to prepare the brackets at a "factory" area and then deliver ("ship") the prepared bracket to the busy orthodontist. Or even more, importantly, it is unclear how the intended shipment of the Muller prepared bracket adds any objectively ascertainable structural distinctions to the device disclosed by Muller. In regard to method claim 24, there is no required shipment step set forth.

Additionally, applicant argues that at the time of the Muller invention in 1965 that light cured adhesives for orthodontics were not in use, "[t]herefore, Muller cannot be combined with any other reference of a later date to teach the use of a light cure adhesive for bonding an appliance to a tooth." The examiner disagrees, the obvious test is based upon what would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention, not at the time one of the prior art references was invented. At the time of applicant's invention, light cured adhesives in the orthodontic field were in fact common place.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller in view of Lemchen and further in view of Kesling (5,263,859). The modified appliance of

Muller and Lemchen shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show a first groove 70 formed in the body and a second groove 71 formed in the base coacting with the first groove to define an opening. Kesling teaches an orthodontic appliance comprising the grooves as claimed (figure 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the appliance to have the opening of Kesling in order to be able to support auxiliaries in view of Kesling.

Action Made Final

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 3732

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

This application has been reassigned because Examiner Bumgarner has taken another position at the Office. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Ralph Lewis** at telephone number **(571) 272-4712**. Fax (571) 273-8300. The examiner works a compressed work schedule and is unavailable every other Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez, can be reached at (571) 272-4964.

R.Lewis
September 25, 2006

/Ralph Lewis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3732